

Decision _____

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Joseph Gorlock,

Complainant,

vs.

San Diego Gas & Electric Company (U 902-M),

Defendant.

(ECP)

Case 04-05-024

(Filed May 13, 2004)

Joseph Gorlock, for himself, complainant.Todd Cahill, for San Diego Gas & Electric Company,
defendant.**OPINION DENYING COMPLAINT**

Complainant asserts that his electric and gas bills are consistently too high and disputes charges billed since 1999. Defendant denied the complaint. A public hearing was held on July 26, 2004.

Complainant testified that he had compared his electric and gas bills with those of other residents in his neighborhood, and states that in comparison his smaller home with fewer individuals should have resulted in a smaller bill. Complainant also claims that incorrect meter reads have resulted in unfairly high electric bills. Complainant states that he has been overcharged \$578, and has impounded \$108.51 with the Commission.

Defendant's witness said complainant's bills were accurate, but slight discrepancies might be a result of estimated meter reads later corrected by observed meter reads. For instance, the witness said, on July 17, 2003, complainant, after requesting a billing and payment summary of his account, phoned in an electric meter read. On July 22, 2003, a service technician arrived at complainant's residence; complainant was not home. Because meter-reading instructions indicated "bad dog in yard," the technician was unable to access the meter. On July 23, 2003, complainant was credited for 100 kilowatt-hours (kWh) due to an over-read of his electric meter that was based on the complainant's phoned-in meter read of July 17, 2003. Defendant's witness said that on October 15, 2003, a San Diego Gas & Electric Company's (SDG&E) representative met with complainant to discuss his energy usage concerns. Complainant informed SDG&E that he attempted to reduce electric consumption, but was upset because his attempt did not produce a reduction. At the request of complainant, the electric meter was replaced.

SDG&E showed that although complainant's bills fluctuated, his actual consumption as shown by meter reads has been consistent over the years. SDG&E contends that complainant's account has been billed correctly, and further that any meter mis-reads were due to lack of access to complainant's meter.

We agree with SDG&E. We have reviewed complainant's bills over the past three years and find no discrepancies from normal usage. His daily average kWhs were reasonable for his load, as was his daily average therm usage. SDG&E's billing to complainant was accurate. The money on deposit with the Commission should be disbursed to defendant.

Assignment of Proceeding

Carl W. Wood is the Assigned Commissioner and Robert Barnett is the assigned Administrative Law Judge in this proceeding.

O R D E R

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. The relief requested by complainant is denied.
2. Funds on deposit with the Commission shall be disbursed to defendant.
3. Case 04-05-024 is closed.

This order is effective today.

Dated _____, at San Francisco, California.